

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/594,432	GE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	DANIEL C. MCCrackEN	1736	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) DANIEL C. MCCrackEN.

(2) Christopher North (50,433).

**Date of Interview:** 30 December 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

Claim 7

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Daniel C. McCracken/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1736

**Status of Application:** Pending - Response to Non-final

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** Approx 3:30 EST

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called to inquire as to the meaning of the "protecting group" recited in Claim 7 as filed in the most recent response. Specifically, in the Examiner's opinion, it was unclear in light of the passage at (S. 7: 8) in the disclosure. The same words were recited, but no examples or discussion of "protecting group" was provided. Applicants representative stated that it meant one of the "normal" organic synthesis "protecting groups." The Examiner then inquired if this was the case, then is the protecting group in fact required in the end product, as most protecting groups are removed. This issue was not resolved.

Cancelling the term was tentatively discussed, but it was going to be impossible to receive authorization from the Applicants before the deadline facing the Examiner. The Examiner stated that if this was the only issue (i.e. cancelling "protecting group") it could be addressed in an after-final amendment. The Examiner reserved the right to deny amendments touching any other issue beyond that addressed in this interview.